

REMARKS

The Office Action of 11/03/2006 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 were rejected as being unpatentable over Badger in view of Krupa. The rejections states in part:

[B]adger discloses the above claimed invention but fails to disclose that the tuner comprises at least one identifier for identifying the database field. Nonetheless, in *related art*, Krupa discloses the use of a barcode... for identifying and matching purposes.... Therefore, it would have been obvious...to incorporate the teachings of Krupa into the teachings of Badger for the purpose of using a barcode as an identifying medium to match the tuning apparatus and the inherently existing memory to allow a person to reload the digital trimming control signals into the *PROM 42* when it is need to.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The logic of the rejection is flawed in at least two respects.


First, Badger and Krupa can hardly be said to be related art. Badger relates to a television tuner. Krupa relates to pharmaceutical dispensing. If Badger and Krupa are related art, then all art is related art, and the test of relatedness is meaningless.

Second, there is no teaching in Badger of any need to reload the digital trimming control signals into the PROM 42. Like all PROMs, PROM 42 of Badger is presumably *one-time* programmable. Its storage is non-volatile, meaning that the data stored cannot be lost. The digital trimming control signals are presumed to remain unchanged. Any

need to reload the digital trimming control signals would therefore appear to be a need to support an otherwise-unfounded rejection of the claims.

For the foregoing reasons, the rejection cannot be supported. Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-11 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 09/12/2007